Contradictory Forms of Government

The "Declaration of Independence" reads in part,

> That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, ...

By "these ends" the Declaration refers to the purpose of government which, according to its third sentence, means "securing" our unalienable Rights. So if a "Form of Government" starts diminishing our "unalienable Rights," then it's the "Right of the People to alter or abolish it . . . ."

That sounds pretty good . . . but what's a "*Form* of Government"?

First, note that one kind of government will have one "form" while another kind of government has an entirely different form. Once we recognize that different kinds of governments are distinguished by their different "forms," we can begin to see that a "form" of government is essentially a pecking order. It's a hierarchy of *authority*, based on rights, sources of rights, and consequent relative status as sovereigns and subjects, masters and servants.

In every instance a fundamental rule applies: The lower party in the "pecking order" must take orders from any higher party. Conversely, the lower party can never give orders to the higher.

For example, the western world (Christendom) has had several fundamental "Forms of Government" (lawform) over the past 1,700 years.

First, starting about 320 A.D., we had the Catholic lawform (aka, "Holy Roman Empire"). This lawform's hierarch of authority consisted of

1) God,
2) Pope;
3) European Kings;
4) government;
5) **subjects** (virtually, all men)

God (#1) gave rights to the Pope (#2 and presumed to be God on Earth) who passed some of those rights on to the #3 European kings (who enjoyed the "divine right of kings" since their rights flowed from the Pope/earthly god). Then the kings (#3) gave whatever powers they wished to

grant to their #4 governments, and/or the #5 people (subjects) at the bottom of the hierarchy. Each level in this pecking order of authority had to take orders from the higher levels, and could give orders to the lower levels. Subjects, being at the bottom of the pecking order, had virtually no rights and had to obey any order—no matter how arbitrary—by any entity who was higher up the pecking order.

Second, in the 1400's, King Henry VIII broke free from the Pope and Catholic lawform and started the English Form of Government:

1) God;
2) King of England;
3) English government;
4) English subjects (serfs; virtually all **men**).

As in the previous Catholic lawform, the great mass of English people remained as subjects without meaningful rights at the bottom of the pecking order. The only real change was that English Kings were now directly subject to God rather than the Pope.

Third, on July 4th, 1776 America began its Federal Republic:

1) God;
2) **man**;
3) States of the Union (Republics);
4) Federal government.

This was the single most radical form of government in at least 3,000 years. For the first time, all men were not automatically *subject* to an earthly king or government. Instead, under our "Declaration of Independence" all Men [including kings and popes] were created equal. Thus, each man was deemed to enjoy the same God-given rights as the former English *King*. Each man was elevated to the status of sovereign, became a master *over* government, and government—for the first time in Western history—was reduced to the lower status of servant/subject.

Note that this Republican Form of Government provided more than a political change in the relationship of man to government; it created a spiritual change in the relationship of man to God.

Under the previous Catholic and English forms of government, only Popes and/or Kings received their rights directly from God. Thus, only Popes and Kings had God-given (unalienable) rights. This was the essential idea behind "*divine* right of kings".

All other men (subjects) received their rights (if any) *through* the Pope or Kings, and typically *through* government, but did not receive those rights

directly from God and thus had no "unalienable Rights". Therefore, unlike Popes and Kings, all other men's "rights" might be "aliened" or taken away by a superior earthly authority.

With America's Republican Form of Government, all this changed.

Suddenly, *all* men (not just kings and popes) were declared to have been directly endowed with "unalienable Rights" by their Creator. Because those rights flowed directly from *God*, no earthly force could lawfully deprive any man of those rights—except for violating God's own Laws. And even then, an individual's unalienable Rights could not be easily revoked without extensive legal protections ("due process") to assure that government did not unlawfully or mistakenly deprive an "innocent man" (one who had not broken God's Law) of his God-given rights.

However, government and commercial interests could not endure the idea that ordinary men could have "unalienable Rights". Government, of course, wanted to rule over (not serve under) the mass of men. And commercial interests did not want to be held easily liable to ordinary men for shoddy products, contractual violations, fair wages or free market competition. As a result, coalitions of moneyed "special interests" and government worked incessantly to degrade the American people back to the status of rightless subjects.

Fourth, that degradation took a mighty leap forward after the Civil War with the adoption of the 14th Amendment. Under this 1868 Amendment a new kind of *national* citizenship was created—ostensibly to provide some semblance of citizenship for the newly-freed Negro slaves. Previously, there'd been no national citizenship. Instead, every American was a Citizen of the State of the Union wherein he was born or naturalized. This new, national, 14th Amendment citizenship was called "citizen of the United States" and all such persons were "*subject* to the jurisdiction" of the "United States". Note that these persons were therefore national "citizen-*subjects*" rather than State Citizen-*sovereigns*.

In addition to creating a new class of national citizenship, the 14th Amendment implicitly acknowledged the co-creation of a new kind of *national* government. This creation is implied by a comparison of the language of the 13th Amendment (1865) and the 14th (1868).

According to the 13th Amendment,

> Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude . . . shall exist within the United States, or any *place* subject to *their* jurisdiction. [emph. add.]

Note that the term "*their* jurisdiction" refers to a *plural* entity. Thus, the term "United States" in the 13th Amendment refers to the *several* States of the Union. Note also that "their" jurisdiction was over *places*—not men. Men were still regarded as sovereigns over government.

However, three years later, the 14th Amendment declared,

> All *persons* born or naturalized in the United States and subject to *the* jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein their reside. [Emph. add.]

First, note that this new jurisdiction is over "persons" rather than places. This is the first time that Congress or the "National" government had direct jurisdiction over "persons" rather than places.

Second, note that the term "*the* jurisdiction thereof" is singular. Thus, unlike the term "United States" in the 13th Amendment that referred to a plural entity, the 14th Amendment instead referenced the "United States" as a *singular* entity. Thus, in two Amendments separated by just three years, we see two different "United States". The "United States" in the 13th Amendment refers to the several States of the Union; the "United States" in the 14th Amendment does not. Instead, the 14th Amendment refers to a new, singular national government (perhaps a corporation) which—so far as I can tell—did not previously exist under our Constitution.

However, under Article One, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution, Congress already enjoyed

> . . . exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may . . . become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all *Places* purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be . . . . [Emph. add.]

But this exclusive authority endowed Congress with sovereignty over a "District" (Washington, D.C.) and some other "*Places*" and physical territory—but apparently not over *persons*.

On the other hand, the 14th Amendment declared all *persons* born or naturalized in the singular "United States" *and subject* to that jurisdiction to be citizens of that [singular] "United States". Congress thereby gained authority over *persons* rather than just *places*.

The 5th Section of the 14th Amendment reads,

> The *Congress* shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article. [Emph. add.]

Insofar as this power of enforcement seems *exclusive* to Congress—but not the several States of the Union in Congress assembled—it appears that *Congress* had become the second, singular "United States". If so, we had the plural "United States" (the States of the Union) to serve under the White men of the U.S.A. and we also had a singular (possibly

corporate) "United States" (Congress) to reign exclusively over American Negroes.

It seems certain that the 14th Amendment at least created a new class of citizen-subjects to accommodate the newly freed Negro slaves. Note that these new citizens are "subject" *under* (not sovereign *over*) the jurisdiction of the national "United States". Thus, the Negroes were never truly "freed" in the sense of becoming Citizens of the State-republics and achieving a status wherein they might claim the unalienable Rights granted by God. Instead, Blacks were simply given the inferior status of citizen-*subjects* of a new, national government. Essentially, Negroes swapped their old slave owners on Southern plantations for the new "slave owners" we call Congress. All the rhetoric about fighting the Civil War to "free the slaves" was pure crapola.

A new "form of government"

The most obvious difference between the post-14th Amendment form of government and the previous "Republican Form of Government" is the creation of a new class of citizens who (like those of the English and Catholic monarchies) were *subjects* subservient to the national government rather than State sovereigns *over* government, and a new "national" government to reign over those subjects.

A proper diagram of the post-14th Amendment form of government might look something like this:

1) God
2) We the (White) People (State Citizen-*sovereigns*)
3) States of the Union (and their governments)
4) General or Federal government (this includes the three co-equal branches—Legislative, Executive & Judicial)
5) NEW: *National* government (the singular "United States"; possibly a corporation within which Congress—not the People and not the Executive or Judicial branches—was the principal "sovereign")
6) NEW: Negro citizen-*subjects* of the singular, national "United States" (Congress).

Under this diagram, Congress—which still shared co-equal authority with the executive and judicial branches over disputes between the States of the Union and also certain limited "places" in our Republican Form of Government—now also enjoyed exclusive legislative jurisdiction over American Negroes ("citizens of the United States") without regard to whether they were in a particular State, or the District of Columbia, or some territory owned by the general government. Insofar as Negroes might be found in any State, territory or district, Congressional jurisdiction over these "persons" was unrestricted by State boundaries and thus "national". This was the beginning of our "national" government—a government over all the *people* of a "nation" rather than a "federal" government which merely governed the interactions of the several States of the Union which composed the "federation".

This new "national" government violated the fundamental feature of our Republican Form of Government: it declared that some persons (Negroes) were *subjects* rather than sovereigns. As such, these Negro "citizen-subjects" were presumed to receive their *civil* rights from their master (Congress) rather than unalienable Rights from God. Thus, the American lawform became confused and at times even contradictory. We had two coexisting forms of government: A Republican Form of Government to serve Whites, a national government to control and rule over Blacks.

Our once simple Republican Form of Government was becoming increasingly complex, confusing and contradictory.

Initially, these contradictions were probably glossed over since they only involved Negroes who were mostly ignorant and only comprised about 5% of the population. Their complaints would be unsophisticated, rare and, if necessary, easily suppressed by the courts without alerting the majority White population to these contradictions.

But once Congress got a taste of being (rather than serving) sovereigns, I imagine they liked it. As Mel Brooks said in his movie *History of the World Part I* as he grabbed the breasts of one his courtesans: "It's *good* to be the King."

But even if Congress didn't intend to become sovereigns in 1868, there would be inevitable legal contradictions in the relationships between the new 14th Amendment citizen-subjects and State's Citizen-sovereigns. Congress would inevitably intervene on behalf of "its" citizen-subjects by passing new laws or initiating new Amendments to eliminate logical contradictions between the two varieties of citizenship. In passing these new laws—and especially Amendments—Congress inevitably extended its national jurisdiction deeper and deeper into the formerly sovereign States and We the People and radically altered our fundamental form of government.

For example, since the Civil War, we've adopted fifteen Amendments to the Constitution. Seven of them (13th, 14th, 15th, 19th, 23rd, 24th, and 26th) specifically declare *Congress shall have power* to enforce that amendment. Every one of those Amendments clearly expand the *national* authority of Congress to intrude into the formerly sovereign States and thereby expand the post-Civil War "national" government while simultaneously degrading the rights and powers of the original Republican Form of Government.

But the most glaring contradiction in our Constitution (and driving force

behind national government) probably springs from the 15th Amendment (1870) which declared,

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

That sounds like a great idea, but this Amendment created a logical contradiction that was unprecedented and impossible for any form of government to resolve or survive. It let *subjects* vote to bind the *sovereigns*.

Remember, under the 14th Amendment, "citizens of the United States" are *subjects* of the national government. These subjects occupied the *lowest* level of authority in our post-14th Amendment "form of government". Their political condition was only slightly elevated above that of slaves. White men, on the other hand, still occupied the highest level earthly authority and were only subject to God.

By guaranteeing national *subjects* the right to vote in State elections, the 15th Amendment allowed 14th Amendment *subjects* to bind State-Citizen *sovereigns*. Thus, under the 15th Amendment, it was theoretically possible in communities where Negroes outnumbered Whites, for Negro citizen-*subjects* to vote to deprive White Citizen-*sovereigns* of their wealth, property or even unalienable Rights.

From today's democratic perspective, we see nothing terribly wrong with a majority of Negroes voting to empower themselves at the expense of a minority of Whites. That's just hard-ball politics, right?

However, we tend to interpret the 15th Amendment's right to vote in *racial* terms of Negroes vs. Whites, but race was not the fundamental issue. The issues were *quality* of rights, form of government and even our relationship to God. The issue was whether the "men" who (under the "Declaration of Independence") were directly endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights and thus sovereign *over* government could be bound by the votes of 14th Amendment "persons" who were *subjects* under government. This was the political equivalent of letting children rule over their parents or allowing English serfs vote to bind King Henry VIII. In olden times such crazy notions were rewarded with a quick beheading.

The 15th Amendment contradicted the fundamental Form of Government postulated by the "Declaration of Independence" (1. God, 2. Man, 3. government) by making #2 Man (formerly subject only to God), now also subject to "persons" and national "citizens" who were "created" by government, occupied a position of authority below government, and were therefore without unalienable Rights.

This form of government was unprecedented, irrational, and impossible to implement. It implicitly asserted that the government-granted civil right of "persons" granted by government were superior to the unalienable Rights granted to men by God.

States Rights vs. Civil Rights

If this description of logical contradictions between the various Amendments and body of the Constitution sounds like an esoteric debate in

ancient philosophy, note that the contradiction eventually erupted violently in the Civil Rights movement of the 1950's and 1960's.

Southern Whites (State Citizen-sovereigns) were doing their level best to keep Southern Negroes (national citizen-subjects) from voting in State elections. The South used every trick it could to keep the *subjects* from voting in State elections. Property ownership requirements and literacy tests (sometimes conducted with newspapers written in Yiddish) used to stop Negro-subjects from voting. Most of the effort to stop Negro voting was dismissed and disparaged by the North as evidence of hateful racism on the part of the red-neck crackers. And to great extent this was true.

But at base, the issue was not whether *Negroes* could vote, but whether national citizen-*subjects* could vote to bind State Citizen-*sovereigns*. The States' Rights vs. Civil Rights struggle was a contest between those Southerners who wanted to keep the "Republican Form of Government" expressly guaranteed by the Constitution, and the Congress which wanted to establish an unauthorized national democracy.

And under the Constitution's guarantee of a "Republican Form of Government" to each State, the South was right. The Negroes shouldn't have been allowed to vote—but not because they were Negroes, but because they were national citizen-*subjects*. Subjects can't vote to bind sovereigns. To allow that inversion of authority is to deny the State-Citizens their unalienable, God-given Rights and 40 centuries of human history. That denial wasn't just hard-ball, secular politics, it was blasphemy.

Nevertheless, the national government and the mainstream media successfully characterized the South's struggle for "State's rights" as evidence of shameless, evil racism. In doing so, they concealed the growing power and extent of the national democracy and the correspondent withering of our "Republican Form of Government".

Was the Civil Rights turmoil spawned by racism? Absolutely. But it wasn't simply the racism of Southern Whites. It was the racism of the post-Civil War Congress who foisted the 14th Amendment off on the American people. Remember, the 14th Amendment didn't elevate Negroes to the same status of State Citizen-*sovereigns* afforded to Whites—it merely created a new "citizenship" for *subjects* at the very bottom of the American political system's form of government. Once that new status of citizen-subject was created, the lowly Negroes were "officially" dumped (once

again) on the very lowest rung of our political system's pecking order (a political trash can). Thanks to the 14th Amendment, Negroes were "elevated" from slave to subject. Huzzah.

So if racism spawned the Civil Rights movement (and all the attendant violence), whose racism was it? Whose racism was greater, more virulent, more hypocritical? The Southern Whites who wanted to keep the State-republics guaranteed in the Constitution? Or the post Civil War Congress that piously claimed they'd damn near destroyed the nation to "free the slaves," but didn't think enough of Negroes to grant them full citizenship?

In any case, the Civil Rights conflict flowed from the contradictions and political tensions that were created by the 14th Amendment. All of that trouble might've been avoided if the Congress of 1868 had simply elevated Negroes to the status of State Citizen-sovereigns rather than national citizen-subjects.

Democracy through gradualism

As irrational consequences of the contradictions between our Republican Form of Government and the new national form of government became increasingly frequent and apparent, government had two choices:

1) They could rescind the 14th Amendment, eliminate the national status of citizen-*subject*, and adopt a new Amendment declaring that all men (including Negroes) born or naturalized in one of the several States of the Union were Citizens of that State-republic and thereby recognized as endowed with God-given, unalienable Rights. Under this arrangement Whites and Negroes would all be equal and individually sovereign *over* government. Or,

2) Congress could stick to their guns and simply patch over the irrational consequences of the 14th and 15th Amendments by passing even more laws and Amendments to sustain (and even expand) the numbers of citizen-subjects.

Of course, Congress did the dishonorable thing, and rather than elevate Negroes to the status of White State Citizens, they expanded the realm of citizen-subjects to include more and more *voters*. Of the fifteen post-Civil War Amendments, five—the 14th ("persons"), 15th (citizen-subjects), 19th (women), 24th (tax delinquents and bankrupts) and 26th (minors under 21 years of age)—expanded the right to *vote* and thereby expanded the national democracy.

Of the fifteen post-Civil War Amendments, six—the 14th (qualification for Congress), 17th (popular election of Senators), 20th (beginning of terms of President, Vice President, and Congress), 22nd (number of terms of President), 23rd (District of Columbia given electors in presidential elections), and 25th (order of succession to office of presidency)—alter the fundamental structure of our national government.

It's at least curious that of the fifteen post-Civil War amendments, six restructure our national government and five expand the privilege to vote. I suspect that all eleven Amendments have surreptitiously laid the foundation for the national democracy that is supplanting our former Republican Form of Government.

New Deal

Our "Republican Form of Government" is mandated and guaranteed to each State of the Union by Article 4 Section 4 of the Constitution. The national democracy did not suddenly appear based on a single Amendment. The foundation for our national democracy was laid "block by block" and Amendment by Amendment from the end of the Civil War in 1865 until Franklin D. Roosevelt became President in 1933. By then, there were sufficient Amendments to virtually establish a national democracy. The public, mired in the Great Depression was willing to accept anything government did, if it would put a "chicken in every pot". Sure enough, our beneficial "chickens" came home to roost in Roosevelt's "New Deal".

It was the "New Deal" that enshrined our national democracy.

However, I doubt that any particular act of the Roosevelt administration *officially* consummated the our national democracy. There may have been several acts that achieved the change collectively. But, so far as I know, there was no single act which officially declared and expressly established the United States to be a democracy rather than a Republic.

More likely, to this day, there's no single "official" act that established the democracy. Instead, I suspect the democracy was silently "established" based on political and/or judicial *presumptions* which deemed every man or woman to be a 14th Amendment "person" and citizen-subject. I suspect we are merely *presumed* to be 14th Amendment persons for a number of reasons:

First, the Article 4 Section 4 of the Constitution still guarantees a "Republican Form of Government" to every State in the Union. That section of the Constitution has never been officially and expressly repealed.

Second, there's never been an Amendment which expressly declared this nation to be a "democracy" rather than a federation of State Republics. In fact, the word "democracy" does not appear in our Constitution. So if challenged, what authority will government cite for imposing the rules and disabilities of democracy upon us?

Third, the last President to refer to this nation as a "Republic" was John F. Kennedy—about 30 years after the onset of the New Deal. That's pretty good evidence that, at least up until 1963, our national democracy had not yet been officially established but was merely *presumed*. After all, if democracy had been officially established, how is it that a President of the United States was unaware of the fact?

The presumption of 14th Amendment citizenship is probably based on any one of several devices. For example, are you registered to vote as a 14th Amendment "citizen of the United States"? Does your birth certificate indicate you were born in a "State of the Union," or in a corporate state-franchise of the national democracy? If your evidence of birth indi-

cates you were born in one of those corporate states, you are "subject to the jurisdiction" of the singular "United States" and thus presumed to be a 14th Amendment citizen-subject. Do you conduct your business affairs by "discharging" your debts with worthless legal tender (Federal Reserve Notes) or do you "pay" your debts with lawful money (gold or silver coin)? If you use the benefit of legal tender, you are probably presumed (under 31 USC 5103) to be a 14th Amendment citizen-*subject*.

The fundamental presumption that we are all 14th Amendment citizen-subjects may be based on the passage of time. In 1868, only a tiny percentage of our population (Negroes) may have been officially presumed to have been born or naturalized in the singular "United States". All others would be presumed to have been born or naturalized in the various States of the Union and thus State Citizen-sovereigns rather than 14th Amendment subjects. But over sixty years passed from 1868 to 1933. During that time, those people who had been undeniably born in a State Republic passed on. Those born after 1868 were increasingly presumed to be "born in the [singular] United States" and thus 14th Amendment citizen-subjects.

And, without supporting evidence, I'd still bet the national democracy is somehow based on the "national emergency" that was declared in 1933 and has persisted to this day.

In fact, there are probably several devices by which government can presume virtually all Americans are 14th Amendment citizen-subjects. But insofar as the "Declaration of Independence" (which can't be amended) is still celebrated every Fourth of July and still declares that "All men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights," I believe the presumption of 14th Amendment citizenship can be challenged and rebutted. Insofar as Article 4 Section 4 of the Constitution still guarantees that each State of the Union must be a "Republican Form of Government" (whose primary purpose must be to "secure" our unalienable Rights) , it seems possible to challenge the presumption that any one of us is a 14th Amendment citizen-subject.

Easier said than done

However, the presumption of 14th Amendment citizenship won't be easily rebutted. For example, how do you establish that you are *domiciled* in a State of the Union rather than living as a *resident* in a corporate state-franchise of the national democracy? Were you born "on" *Texas* (a State of the Union)? Or were you born "in" the STATE OF TEXAS (a corporate, territorial franchise)? Where's your evidence?

Chances are, your birth certificate indicates you were born "in" (subject to) a corporate state-franchise. Insofar as you voluntarily use that birth certificate without protest, you'll be presumed to be a 14th Amendment citizen-subject. Insofar as you use any identification that was based on that birth certificate, you'll be presumed to be a 14th Amendment citizen-subject.

Do you have "residential" phone service? Are your utilities (gas, electricity, water) even available in a State of the Union and thus outside of a corporate state under the 14th Amendment? I'll bet those public utilities are so

subsidized by the national government, that they can't be used without creating the presumption that their customers are 14th Amendment citizens.

Overcoming the presumption that you're a citizen-subject will require a great deal of daily diligence. I doubt that the presumption of 14th Amendment citizenship can be finally overcome by simply filing some papers with various state and national officials. While it may be necessary to file such papers to initiate a restoration of your status as a free man, it would thereafter be necessary to diligently avoid or expressly protest any subsequent use of the many benefits provided to 14th Amendment citizen-subjects.

In other words, it might not be enough to merely claim to be a free man. You might have to walk the walk. You might actually have to *live* like a free man, every moment of every subsequent day. And that's not easy. You'd have to choose to serve God rather than government. Such service would mean more than going to church every Sunday (unless you play golf, of course). You'd have to be completely responsible for your acts (no limited liability through insurance, corporations or trusts). You might even have to arrange to pay all of your debts (at least in part) with lawful money.

But if you stopped acting like a sovereign Citizen and slouched back into the indigence of government benefits, government might be re-enabled to presume you are a 14th Amendment citizen-subject and treat you accordingly.

Thus, I believe it's difficult but still possible for determined individuals to reestablish themselves as a free men. However, this transformation will require exceptional intelligence, education and persistent diligence. It won't be easy, and most Americans won't up to the task. If I had to guess, I'd bet that no more than 10% of America is potentially capable of individually regaining their status as a free man.

But even if that 10% did reclaim their freedoms, how safe could those freedoms be in a nation where 90% remained as subjects? Natural jealousies would almost certainly be exploited to reduce the 10% free back to the same status as the 90% subjects.

28th Amendment?

Therefore, for any single person to be free, the entire nation must be free. How could we restore freedom and unalienable Rights to all Americans? Adopt another constitutional Amendment or two.

For example, if we were to repeal the 14th Amendment's classification of persons as citizen-subjects and replace it with a similar Amendment that declared all human beings (not just White men) were endowed by God with "certain unalienable Rights," the inconsistencies, irrationalities and contradictions created by the 14th and 15th Amendments would disappear. Under this proposed Amendment, all of us would once again

be declared to be free and sovereign *over* government, rather than bound and subject *under* government.

The language would be simple. We could plagiarize the "Declaration of Independence". All we'd need to add to the Constitution is a statement that "All men [including citizens of the United States] are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights . . ."

That's all it takes. We would all become sovereigns over government rather than subjects, and there would be no fundamental conflict between any State or national citizenship.

Properly promoted, such an Amendment should appeal to almost everyone--except government and the New World Order. Those who favor illegal immigration and abortion would oppose repealing the 14th Amendment. (An illegal alien who gives birth to a child "in the United States" is thus the mother of a 14th Amendment "citizen of the United States" and, as such, unlikely to be deported. Similarly, those children who are not yet "born" are not yet "citizens of the United States" and thus have no statutory protections against being murdered while in the womb.)

Despite this resistance, passage of the proposed Amendment would regain the same level of freedom once celebrated by our Founders for every living (and even unborn) American. Think of it. Every right espoused in the Bill of Rights would once more become absolute, without any susceptibility to government meddling.

What politician could openly oppose such amendment? Can government persuade Americans we are better off being less free? Not easily.

In an open competition between the unalienable Rights granted by God and the civil "rights" (actually, "privileges") granted by government, who would choose to reject God's blessings for sovereigns and instead embrace the civil rights of subjects?

Think of it. Properly crafted, an Amendment that declared all natural men and women to enjoy unalienable Rights could restore American freedoms. Arguments to support that resurrection of freedom wouldn't be complex or hard to explain. And who could resist? A movement to promote such Amendment could be started today and potentially sweep the country within ten years.

Imagine. Free at last, free at last, . . . thank God almighty, ...

But until such Amendment is adopted, America remains the "land of the free" much like Egypt remains the "land of the Pharaohs". Just as there were (but are no longer) any Pharaohs in Egypt, there were (but are few, if any) free men in America.

But with just one or two simple constitutional Amendments to repeal the 14th and reestablish the unalienable Rights of all Americans, free men and women could be removed from the "politically endangered species" list and once again flourish in the U.S.A..